UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/552,678	10/10/2005	Andreas Bacher	WAS0708PUSA	3843	
22045 BROOKS KUS	7590 11/03/200 HMAN P.C.	9	EXAMINER		
1000 TOWN C	ENTER	OJURONGBE, OLATUNDE S			
TWENTY-SEC SOUTHFIELD:			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/03/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/552,678	BACHER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
OLATUNDE S. OJURONGBE	1796	

	OLATUNDE S. OJURONGBE	1796					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
	a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external contents.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	ithin the time period set forth in 37 (CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS		20 (b (1 b					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further contained to the properties of the prope	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reje						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Randy Gulakowski/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: in response to the applicant's argument that the phrase "wherein the primer is free of metal complexes" is supported by the specification, the examiner notes that nowhere in the specification is it mentioned that the primer of the invention is free of metal complexes. The fact that the specification does not disclose a primer comprising metal complexes does not justify the inclusion of the phrase "free of metal complexes" in the claims. Furthermore, the examiner notes that the removal of copper (II) acetate-as the applicant purports-from the primer of example 1 does not support the claim to a primer free of metal complexes, because the metal complexes of the instant claims encompass a broader range of compounds than the copper (II) acetate of example. In response to the applicant's argument that the claim to a continuous release layer is supported by the indication, in the specification, that the primer is prepared by such methods that include dipping, brushing, pouring, and spraying, the examiner notes that such methods mentioned by the applicant are also used in the preparation of non-continuous layers. In response to the applicant's argument about the examiner's interpretation of "consisting essentially of" as "comprising", the examiner notes that the applicant fails to state how the chrome stearate complex of the prior art affects the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention (See MPEP 2111.03). The applicant further reiterated arguments of the previous office action, to which the examiner's stance remains as stated in prior office action.